



# 2023-2024 OSM WORK PLAN APPLICATION

This form will be used to assess the merits of the proposed work plan and its fit with the Oil Sands Monitoring (OSM) Program mandate and strategic priorities. Applicants must complete the form in its entirety. Applicants that fail to use this form and complete all sections in the timeframe will not be considered.

OSM Work Plan Submission Deadline: The deadline for submission of proposed work plans is <b>October 31, 2022 at 4:30 PM Mountain Standard time</b> . Late submissions will not be accepted.	<b>October 31, 2022</b> 4:30 PM MST
<b>Decision Notification</b>	Mid to Late March 2023

## WORK PLAN COMPLETION

Please **Enable Macros** on the form when prompted.

The applicant is required to provide information in sufficient detail to allow the evaluation team to assess the work plan. Please follow the requirements/instructions carefully while at the same time being concise in substantiating the project's merits. The OSM Program is not responsible for the costs incurred by the applicant in the preparation and submission of any proposed work plan.

**Privacy:** The OSM Program is governed by the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIP) and may be required to disclose information received under this Application, or other information delivered to the OSM Program in relation to a Project, when an access request is made by anyone in the public. Applicants are encouraged to familiarize themselves with FOIP. All work plans are public documents.

**Technical Requirements:** When working on this form, please maintain Macros compatibility by always saving your draft and your final submission as a **Microsoft Word Macro-Enabled Document**, failure to do so will result in loss of form functionality. This form was created using Microsoft word 2016 on a PC and may not have functionality on other versions of Microsoft on PC or MACS.

**Government Lead/Coordinator:** All work plans under the OSM Program require either a government lead or a government coordinator. This will ensure that the financial tables (for Alberta Environment and Parks & Environment and Climate Change Canada) are completed accurately for work plan consideration. **However**, if an **Indigenous community, environmental nongovernmental organization** or any other **external partner** is completing a work plan proposal, they would **only** complete the **grant or contract budget component** of the **Human Resources & Financials Section** for their project. The government coordinator within Alberta Environment & Parks would be responsible for completing the remaining components of the Human Resources and Financial Section of this Work Plan Application, as they are responsible for contract and grant facilitation of successful submissions. All other sections outside of **Human Resources & Financials Section** of this work plan proposal are to be completed in full by all applicants.

**Supplemental Materials:** The OSM Program recognizes that majority of work planning submissions are a result of joint effort and monitoring expertise. Should the applicant wish to submit supplemental materials in addition to their application additional resources are available in the Work Planning Package accessible here: [2023-24 Work Planning Package \(Ctrl+CLICK\)](#)

Should you have any **questions** about completing this work planning form or uploading your final submission documents, please send all inquiries by email to: [OSM.Info@gov.ab.ca](mailto:OSM.Info@gov.ab.ca).



## WORK PLAN SUBMISSION

Upon completion of this application, please submit the appropriately named work plan (**Microsoft Word Macro-Enabled Document**) and all supporting documents to the link provided below. Failure to follow the naming convention provided may result in oversight of your application.

Please upload (by drag and dropping) the **WORK PLAN SUBMISSION & ALL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS** here:

[\*\*WORK PLAN SUBMISSION LINK \(CTRL+CLICK HERE\)\*\*](#)

Please use the following file naming convention when submitting your **WORK PLAN**:

**202324\_wkpln\_WorkPlanTitle\_ProjectLeadLastNameFirstName**

**Example:**

202324\_wkpln\_OilSandsResiduesinFishTissue\_SmithJoe

If applicable, please use the following file naming convention when submitting your **supplementary or supporting files**. Please number them according to the guidance and examples provided:

**202324\_sup##\_WorkPlanTitle\_ProjectLeadLastNameFirstName**

**Examples:**

202324\_sup01\_OilSandsResiduesinFishTissue\_SmithJoe

202324\_sup02\_OilSandsResiduesinFishTissue\_SmithJoe

.

.

.

202324\_sup10\_OilSandsResiduesinFishTissue\_SmithJoe

**Do not resave your work plan or documents under any other naming conventions.** If you need to make revisions and resubmit before the work planning deadline of October 31, 2022, **DO NOT** rename your submission. When resubmitting, simply resubmit with the exact naming convention so that it replaces the original submission. **DO NOT** add any additional components such as versioning or dates to the file naming convention. Please direct any questions regarding the submission or naming of submissions to [OSM.Info@gov.ab.ca](mailto:OSM.Info@gov.ab.ca).



## WORK PLAN APPLICATION

PROJECT INFORMATION	
<b>Project Title:</b>	Indigenous Indicator Prioritization
<b>Lead Applicant, Organization, or Community:</b>	Fort McKay First Nation
<b>Work Plan Identifier Number:</b> <i>If this is an on-going project please fill the identifier number for 22/23 fiscal by adjusting the last four digits: <b>Example:</b> D-1-2223 would become D-1-2324</i>	B-CM-x-2324
<b>Project Region(s):</b>	Athabasca
<b>Project Start Year:</b> <i>First year funding under the OSM program was received for this project (if applicable)</i>	2023
<b>Project End Year:</b> <i>Last year funding under the OSM program is requested <b>Example:</b> 2024</i>	2024
<b>Total 2023/24 Project Budget:</b> <i>For the 2023/24 fiscal year</i>	\$694,000.00
<b>Requested OSM Program Funding:</b> <i>For the 2023/24 fiscal year</i>	\$694,000.00
<b>Project Type:</b>	Community Based Monitoring
<b>Project Theme:</b>	Cross-Cutting
<b>Anticipated Total Duration of Projects (Core and Focused Study (3 years))</b>	Year 1
<b>Current Year</b>	<b>Focused Study:</b> Year 1 of 3
	<b>Core Monitoring:</b> Choose an item.

CONTACT INFORMATION	
<b>Lead Applicant/ Principal Investigator:</b> <i>Every work plan application requires one lead applicant. This lead is accountable for the entire work plan and all deliverables.</i>	Dr. Carla Davidson
<b>Job Title:</b>	Environmental Monitoring Support
<b>Organization:</b>	Fort McKay First Nation Sustainability Department
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 5360, Fort McMurray, AB. T9H 3G4
<b>Phone:</b>	403-703-0125
<b>Email:</b>	carla@endeavoursci.com

## PROJECT SUMMARY

Should your application be successful, The OSM Program reserves the right to publish this work plan application. Please check the box below to acknowledge you have read and understand:

I acknowledge and understand

In the space below please provide a summary (300 words max) of the proposed project that includes a brief overview of the project drivers and objectives, the proposed approach/methodology, project deliverables, and how the project will deliver to the OSM Program objectives. The summary should be written in plain language.

Eleven Indigenous communities (Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation, Fort Chipewyan Metis Nation, Fort McKay First Nation, Fort McKay Metis Nation, Mikisew Cree First Nation, Chipewyan Prairie Dene First Nation, Fort McMurray #468 First Nation, Conklin Metis, Owl River Metis, Chard Metis, Willow Lake Metis Nation), are collaborating to co-define monitoring priorities. This workplan supports work for several technical representatives, analytical support and a coordinator to work with the communities to co-define Indigenous community monitoring priorities.

In this workplan, year one of potentially three years, the group will a) work with their communities to define a knowledge translation approach for environmental monitoring b) do analysis to determine the power and specificity of OSM's existing western science indicators, c) based on these results and Indigenous knowledge, work with the communities to prioritize existing western science indicators and understand their pre-industrial baseline, d) develop an internal data set and database to support ongoing analysis and e) identify data gaps, including compliance monitoring data needs. The work will be broken out into the following phases:

### Phase 1: Data collation, knowledge translation and analysis frameworks

Select Indigenous TAC Representatives (see section x for names) from the Wetland, Groundwater, Aquatics, Air and Deposition and Data Analytics will collate available data from core monitoring under these themes. The team will have a workshop to develop an analytical approach to a) assessing the power of the indicator to detect change, b) the responsiveness of the indicator to specific stressors, c) the indicator's temporal and spatial scale. The team will prioritize the indicators that can be assessed this year based on data availability and suitability. The team will also develop a knowledge translation plan, which will identify what communities decision making needs are, what the communities' information needs are, how best to address those needs through monitoring data, and to develop reporting and communication tools to meet these communities' needs. These two plans will guide all subsequent phases.

### Phase 2a: Data analysis

The OSM program still tends to monitor many indicators, throughout the region, all the time, without having assessed the data for its suitability and power. The Data Analysis step will address this issue. Technical representatives will compile and assess existing analyses. We anticipate that the terrestrial biological, wetlands and groundwater theme areas are the furthest from having sufficient accessible data to perform the needed analyses, so the team will have a workshop to assess their readiness and the state of the existing data and analyses. The team will also workshop all the toxicology and contaminants workplans to link the work being done between the different priority areas. Finally, team members will assess existing OSM indicators for their power, responsiveness to stressor pathways, and spatial and temporal scales, prioritizing the aquatics, air and deposition theme areas.

The technical team will also develop a cohesive database for internal use, and identify data gaps, including compliance data needs.

#### Phase 2b: Community engagement

Community representatives and relevant technical specialists will work with communities to identify information needs, key indicators, and some information to support characterization of baseline. This work will be guided by and inform the Knowledge Translation plan outlined in Phase 1, and will be coordinated with community-specific work to define key concerns. The communities will internally identify areas of environmental change that have impacted their members' abilities to exercise their communities' rights, livelihoods, culture and food security. Note that this work will also be coordinated with work being done under ICBMAC to develop socio-cultural indicators.

#### Phase 3: Reporting and Verification

The technical team and community representatives will have a two day workshop to present findings, and collaboratively prioritize indicators and make recommendations on their analyses, reporting and any needed modifications. Community representatives will validate this direction with community members.

This work will help inform participating communities on what data are available and what the data are telling us and how the existing monitoring can be built upon or amended to meet community needs. The two deliverables knowledge translation plan and Indigenous indicator prioritization report will help inform the OSM program in its ongoing efforts to rationalize monitoring and develop a monitoring framework and knowledge translation approach.

## 1.0 Merits of the Work Plan

All work plans under the OSM Program must serve the mandate of the program by determining (1) if changes in indicators are occurring in the oil sands region and (2) if the changes are caused by oil sands development activities and (3) the contribution in the context of cumulative effects. In the space below please provide information on the following:

- Describe the key drivers for the project identifying linkages to Adaptive Monitoring framework particularly as it relates to surveillance, confirmation and limits of change (as per OC approved Key Questions).
- Explain the knowledge gap as it relates to the Adaptive Monitoring that is being addressed along with the context and scope of the problem as well as the Source – pathway – Receptor Conceptual Models .
- Describe how the project meets the mandate of the OSM Program or areas of limited knowledge is the work being designed to answer with consideration for the TAC specific Scope of Work Document (attached) and the Key Questions (attached)?
- Discuss results of previous monitoring/studies/development and what has been achieved to date. Please identify potential linkages to relevant sections of the State of Environment Report.

The key drivers for this workplan are to identify community concerns and determine whether existing monitoring approaches have the power and specificity to address those concerns. These communities have not had the opportunity to collectively identify culturally relevant indicators and assess whether existing monitoring addresses these questions. The communities identified developing community-driven baselines and limits of change; this work is the first step in developing these.

The monitoring stressor pathway models developed in OSM's early days have not yet been validated by community members. This work will provide the information required to help the technical TACs do the needed work over the coming year to prioritize indicators and understand baseline from the Indigenous perspective.

This project contributes to OSM's mandate in ensuring that indicators and monitoring approaches integrate Indigenous knowledge, meet community needs and are sufficiently sensitive to oil sands stressors.

Some members of the technical team contributed to 2021's Oil Sands Monitoring Condition of Environment paper series in the International Journal of Impact Assessment. One of the tasks of this workplan will be to build on this knowledge with publications that have arisen since these summaries were published.

The Knowledge Translation Plan will identify information needs of the communities, and therefore will help inform the reporting done under the State of Environment Reports.

## 2.0 Objectives of the Work Plan

List in point form the Objectives of the 2023/24 work plan below

1. Develop a Knowledge Translation Plan for the participating Indigenous communities
2. Prioritize the OSM indicators based on community priorities and statistical power/specificity
3. Develop an internal database and scan of data needs, including industry compliance data
4. Develop an understanding of community perspectives on monitoring to meet their needs
5. Inform the communities' input into OSM monitoring

### 3.0 Scope

#### Evaluation of Scope Criteria (Information Box Only- No action required)

Your workplan will be evaluated against the criteria below. A successful workplan would:

- be in scope of the OSM Program (e.g., regional boundaries, specific to oil sands development, within boundaries of the Oil Sands Environmental Monitoring Program Regulation)
- consider the TAC-specific Scope of Work document and the key questions
- integrate western science with Indigenous Community-Based Monitoring)
- address the Adaptive Monitoring particularly as it relates to surveillance, confirmation and limits of change as per approved Key Questions.
- have an experimental design that addresses the Pressure/Stressor, Pathway/Exposure, Response continuum
- produce data/knowledge aligned with OSM Program requirements and is working with Service Alberta
- uses Standard Operating Procedures/ Best Management Practices/ Standard Methods including for Indigenous Community-Based Monitoring

### 3.1 Sub Theme

Please select from the dropdown menu below the theme(s) your monitoring work plan relates to:

Cross Cutting

### 3.2 Core Monitoring or Focused study

Please select from the dropdown menu below if the monitoring in the work plan is "core monitoring" and/or a "focused study". Core monitoring are long term monitoring programs that have been in operation for at least 3 years, have been previously designated by the OSM program as core, and will continue to operate into the future. Focused studies are short term projects 1-2 years that address a specific emerging issue. For the purposes of 2023/24 work planning all Community Based Monitoring Projects are Focused Studies.

Focused Study (includes Community-Based Monitoring)

### 3.3 Sub Theme Key Questions

Please select from the dropdown menus below the sub-theme(s) your monitoring work plan relates to and address the Key Questions:

#### 3.3.1 Surface Water Theme

##### 3.3.1.1. Sub Themes:

Choose an item.

##### 3.4.1.2 Surface Water Key Questions

Explain how your surface water monitoring program addresses the key questions below.

1. Has baseline been established? Have thresholds or limits of change been identified?

Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Are changes occurring in water quality, biological health (e.g., benthos, fish) and/or water quantity/flows relative to baseline? If yes, is there evidence that the observed change is attributable to oil sands development? (Describe source-pathway-receptor and/or conceptual models and what is the contribution in the context of cumulative effects?)

Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Are there unanticipated results in the data? If yes, is there need for investigation of cause studies?

Click or tap here to enter text.

4. Are changes in water quality and/or water quantity and/or biological health informing Indigenous key questions and concerns?

Click or tap here to enter text.

5. Are data produced following OSM Program requirements and provided into the OSM Program data management system?

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Do methodologies use relevant Standard Operating Procedures/ Best Management Practices/ Standard Methods?

Click or tap here to enter text.

7. How does the monitoring identify integration amongst projects, themes or with communities?

Click or tap here to enter text.

8. With consideration for adaptive monitoring, where does the proposed monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program?

Click or tap here to enter text.

9. How will this work advance understanding transition towards adaptive monitoring?

Click or tap here to enter text.





10. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting? If yes, please identify potential linkages to relevant sections of the State of Environment Report.

Click or tap here to enter text.



**3.3.2 Groundwater Theme**

**3.3.2.1 Sub Themes:**

Choose an item.

**3.3.2.2 Groundwater Key Questions**

Explain how your groundwater monitoring program addresses the key questions below.

1. Has baseline been established? Have thresholds or limits of change been identified?

Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Are changes occurring in groundwater quality and/or quantity relative to baseline? If yes, is there evidence that the observed change is attributable to oil sands development? (*Describe source-pathway-receptor and/or conceptual models*) and what is the contribution in the context of cumulative effects?

Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Are there unanticipated results in the data? If yes, is there need for investigation of cause studies?

Click or tap here to enter text.

4. Are changes in groundwater quality and/or quantity informing Indigenous key questions and concerns Indigenous concerns and health?

Click or tap here to enter text.

5. Are data produced following OSM Program requirements and provided into the OSM Program data management system?

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Do methodologies use relevant Standard Operating Procedures/ Best Management Practices/ Standard Methods?

Click or tap here to enter text.

7. How does the monitoring identify integration amongst projects, themes or with communities?

Click or tap here to enter text.

8. With consideration for adaptive monitoring, where does the proposed monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program?

Click or tap here to enter text.

9. How will this work advance understanding transition towards adaptive monitoring?

Click or tap here to enter text.

10. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting? If yes, please identify potential linkages to relevant sections of the State of Environment Report.

Click or tap here to enter text.



**3.3.3 Wetlands Theme**

**3.3.3.1 Sub Themes:**

Choose an item.

**3.3.3.2 Wetlands - Key Questions**

Explain how your wetlands monitoring program addresses the key questions below.

1. Has baseline been established? Have thresholds or limits of change been identified?

Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Are changes occurring in wetlands due to contaminants and hydrological processes? If yes, is there evidence that the observed change is attributable to oil sands development? (Describe source-pathway-receptor and/or conceptual models) and what is the contribution in the context of cumulative effects?

Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Are there unanticipated results in the data? If yes, is there need for investigation of cause studies?

Click or tap here to enter text.

4. Are changes in wetlands informing Indigenous key questions and concerns?

Click or tap here to enter text.

5. Are data produced following OSM Program requirements and provided into the OSM Program data management system?

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Do methodologies use relevant Standard Operating Procedures/ Best Management Practices/ Standard Methods?

Click or tap here to enter text.

7. How does the monitoring identify integration amongst projects, themes or with communities?

Click or tap here to enter text.

8. With consideration for adaptive monitoring, where does the proposed monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program?

Click or tap here to enter text.

9. How will this work advance understanding transition towards adaptive monitoring?

Click or tap here to enter text.

10. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting? If yes, please identify potential linkages to relevant sections of the State of Environment Report.

Click or tap here to enter text.



**3.3.4 Air Theme**

**3.3.4.1 Sub Themes:**

Choose an item.

**3.3.4.2 Air & Deposition - Key Questions**

Explain how your air & deposition monitoring program addresses the key questions below.

1. Has baseline been established? Have thresholds or limits of change been identified?

Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Are changes occurring in air quality? If yes, is there evidence that the observed change is attributable to oil sands development? (Describe source-pathway-receptor and/or conceptual models) and what is the contribution in the context of cumulative effects?

Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Are there unanticipated results in the data? If yes, is there need for investigation of cause studies

Click or tap here to enter text.

4. Are changes in air quality informing Indigenous key questions and concerns?

Click or tap here to enter text.

5. Are data produced following OSM Program requirements and provided into the OSM Program data management system?

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Do methodologies use relevant Standard Operating Procedures/ Best Management Practices/ Standard Methods?

Click or tap here to enter text.

7. How does the monitoring identify integration amongst projects, themes or with communities?

Click or tap here to enter text.

8. With consideration for adaptive monitoring, where does the proposed monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program?

Click or tap here to enter text.

9. How will this work advance understanding transition towards adaptive monitoring?

Click or tap here to enter text.

10. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting? If yes, please identify potential linkages to relevant sections of the State of Environment Report.

Click or tap here to enter text.



**3.3.5 Terrestrial Biology Theme**

**3.3.5.1 Sub Themes:**

Choose an item.

**3.3.5.2 Terrestrial Biology - Key Questions**

Explain how your terrestrial biological monitoring program addresses the key questions below.

1. Has baseline been established? Have thresholds or limits of change been identified?

Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Are changes occurring in terrestrial ecosystems due to contaminants and landscape alteration? If yes, is there evidence that the observed change is attributable to oil sands development? (Describe source-pathway-receptor and/or conceptual models) and what is the contribution in the context of cumulative effects?

Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Are there unanticipated results in the data? If yes, is there need for investigation of cause studies?

Click or tap here to enter text.

4. Are changes in terrestrial ecosystems informing Indigenous key questions and concerns?

Click or tap here to enter text.

5. Are data produced following OSM Program requirements and provided into the OSM Program data management system?

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Do methodologies use relevant Standard Operating Procedures/ Best Management Practices/ Standard Methods?

Click or tap here to enter text.

7. How does the monitoring identify integration amongst projects, themes or with communities?

Click or tap here to enter text.

8. With consideration for adaptive monitoring, where does the proposed monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program?

Click or tap here to enter text.

9. How will this work advance understanding transition towards adaptive monitoring?

Click or tap here to enter text.

10. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting? If yes, please identify potential linkages to relevant sections of the State of Environment Report.

Click or tap here to enter text.



**3.3.6 Cross-Cutting Across Theme Areas**

**3.3.6.1 Sub Themes:**

Integrated Analytics & Cumulative Effects

If "Other" was selected from the drop down list above please describe below:

Click or tap here to enter text.

**3.3.6.2 Cross-Cutting - Key Questions**

Explain how your cross-cutting monitoring program addresses the key questions below.

1. Is data produced following OSM Program requirements and provided into the OSM Program data management system?

The data will require access to existing OSM data, but will not produce new data. The results of analyses will be provided to the program, and help feed the program's need for a cohesive synthesis of existing data.

2. Do methodologies use relevant Standard Operating Procedures/ Best Management Practices/ Standard Methods?

The community engagement will meet the requirements of the ICBMAC ethics guidance, and statistical analyses will be guided by best practices and state of the art knowledge.

3. How does the monitoring identify integration amongst projects, themes or with communities?

This work is designed specifically to promote integration amongst theme and community needs. The workshop on contaminants will help inform the communities on how to recommend integration between contaminants workplans, and all the work will help inform communities on how to integrate their priorities and knowledge into the core monitoring program.

4. With consideration for adaptive monitoring, where does the proposed monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program?

Rather than focusing on a specific area of the conceptual models, this work will allow communities to validate the existing conceptual models and prioritize monitoring relevant from their perspective.

5. How will this work advance understanding transition towards adaptive monitoring?

Adaptive monitoring requires the establishment of limits of change to focus monitoring on areas of highest risk. Developing these limits of change requires identifying indicators that are meaningful to the communities, and have sufficient power to detect change. This work will allow the communities to prioritize their key indicators, inform a pre-industrial baseline, and set the stage for establishing limits of change in subsequent years.

6. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting? If yes, please identify potential linkages to relevant sections of the State of Environment Report.

Yes, the knowledge translation plan will help identify community information needs, which will inform the structure and content of future State of Environment Reports

## 4.0 Mitigation

### **Evaluation of Mitigation Criteria (Information Box Only- No action required)**

Your workplan will be evaluated against the criteria below. A successful workplan would potentially inform:

- efficacy of an existing regulation or policy
- an EPEA approval condition
- a regional framework (i.e., LARP)
- an emerging issue

Explain how your monitoring program informs management, policy and regulatory compliance. As relevant consider adaptive monitoring and the approved Key Questions in your response.

Several potential impacts to Indigenous rights have been identified in the project approval process that were deemed to have been dealt with by oil sands monitoring. This work will help inform the communities the extent to which this is the case.

## 5.0 Indigenous Issues

### Evaluation of Indigenous Issues Criteria (Information Box Only- No action required)

Your workplan will be evaluated against the criteria below. A successful workplan would potentially:

- Investigate Indigenous communities key questions and concerns
- Includes culturally relevant receptor(s) and indicator(s)
- Include or be driven by Indigenous communities (participatory or collaborative)
- Develop capacity in Indigenous communities
- Include a Council Resolution or Letter of Support from one or more Indigenous communities
- Describe how ethics protocols and best practices regarding involvement of Indigenous peoples will be adhered to
- Provide information on how Indigenous Knowledge will be collected, interpreted, validated, and used in a way that meets community Indigenous Knowledge protocols

Explain how your monitoring activities are inclusive and respond to Indigenous key questions and concerns and inform the ability to understand impacts on concerns and inform Section 35 Rights

This program is driven by communities and their intention to use OSM core monitoring data to address community concerns. A key aspect of this work is to build the capacity of the communities to utilize OSM data and work with the program to ensure that their needs are met. OSM's draft ethics protocols will be adhered to (specifically in regards to the collection, validation, and use of IK) in this workplan (i.e., OPAC principles) as will be communities' internal ethics policies.

Support for this research proposal is indicated by a motion [DATE] of the Wood Buffalo Indigenous Sub-Caucus as outlined in their Terms of Reference.

Does this project include an Integrated Community Based Monitoring Component?

Yes

If YES, please complete the [ICBM Abbreviated Work Plan Forms](#) and submit using the link below

[ICBM WORK PLAN SUBMISSION LINK \(CTRL+CLICK HERE\)](#)



## 5.1 Alignment with Interim Ethical Guidelines for ICBM in the OSM Program

1. Are there any community specific protocols that will be followed?

Yes. Several of the participating communities have their own ethics and data sharing protocols; these will be followed.

2. Does the work plan involve methods for Indigenous participants to share information or knowledge (e.g. interview, focus group, survey/structured interview), or any other Indigenous participation? If yes, describe how risks and harms will be assessed, and the consent process that will be used.

Yes. Any activity that involves the collection of Indigenous knowledge (IK) will begin with an informed consent process whereby the following topics will be explained to IK holders: objectives and purpose of the study, the researchers, their participation, their privacy, risks and benefits, how their information will be used, conflict of interest, verification, and their consent (written or oral).

3. Do the activities include any other collecting/sharing, interpreting, or applying Indigenous knowledge? Please describe how these activities will be conducted in alignment with the Interim Ethical Guidelines, and any community-based protocols and/or guidelines that may also apply.

Yes, IK will be interpreted and applied. This process will be iterative with IK holders to ensure that the IK is not extracted and de-contextualized in a western science context. A verification meeting will be held at the end of the year to ensure that IK holders are in support of final applications and presentations of IK.

4. Indicate how Indigenous communities / Indigenous knowledge holders will be involved to ensure appropriate analysis, interpretation and application of data and knowledge.

As discussed above, an iterative process with IK holders will ensure that analysis, interpretation and application of their IK is appropriate and done cooperatively. IK will inform the analysis of western science data and drive the prioritization of indicators. A verification meeting will be held at the end of the year with each community to ensure that IK holders support the work.

5. How are Indigenous communities involved in identifying or confirming the appropriateness of approach, methods, and/or indicators?

Indigenous communities inform and drive the knowledge translation plan, and the prioritization of indicators, and any consideration of baseline or appropriate reference conditions. The workplan is led by the collaborating Indigenous communities.

6. How does this work plan directly benefit your community? How does it support capacity building in your community?

This workplan will empower communities to use the OSM data for their own purposes, whether that be the ability of land users to access and trust their resources, or for their communities' internal planning and management. Also, the workplan will facilitate the hiring of a local monitoring coordinator who will co-develop the data management and knowledge translation approach, and remain with the communities after the end of the program.

7. How is the information from this work plan going to be reported back to your community in a way that is accessible, transparent and easy to understand?

The Knowledge Translation Plan will be essential to ensure that communication is meaningful to the community. This is achieved by clearly understanding the communities' key questions, and the decisions that the community and members make that rely on these data. The workplan includes detailed



community engagement and a verification meeting to approve the approach to reporting. This work will set the stage for more meaningful annual community reporting on key questions.

## 6.0 Measuring Change

### **Evaluation of Measuring Change Criteria (Information Box Only- No action required)**

Your workplan will be evaluated against the criteria below. A successful workplan would potentially:

- assess changes in environmental conditions compared to baseline (e.g., validation of EIA predictions)
- report uncertainty in estimates and monitoring is of sufficient power to detect change due to oil sands development on reasonable temporal or spatial scales
- include indicators along the spectrum of response (e.g., individual, population, community)
- focus on areas of highest risk (where change is detected, where change is greater than expected, where development is expected to expand (collection of baseline))
- measure change along a stressor gradient or a stressor/reference comparison

Explain how your monitoring identifies environmental changes and how can be assessed against a baseline condition. As relevant, consider adaptive monitoring, the TAC specific Scope of Work document and the Key Questions in your response.

The intent of this work is to assess the power of the existing core monitoring plans to detect change. This is key information for prioritizing the existing indicators. Furthermore, during community engagement, we will talk to community members about historical conditions of prioritized indicators to inform baseline condition.

## 7.0 Accounting for Scale

### **Evaluation of Accounting for Scale Criteria (Information Box Only - No action required)**

Your workplan will be evaluated against the criteria below. A successful workplan would potentially be:

- appropriate to the key question and indicator of interest
- relevant to sub-regional and regional questions
- relevant to organism, population and/or community levels of biological organization
- where modelled results are validated with monitored data
- where monitoring informs on environmental processes that occur at a regional scale. e.g. Characterizing individual sources to gain a regional estimate of acid deposition and understand signal from individual contributing sources.

Explain how your monitoring tracks regional and sub-regional state of the environment, including cumulative effects. As relevant, consider adaptive monitoring, the TAC specific Scope of Work document and the Key Questions in your response.

One of the aims of the analytical piece of the workplan is to determine whether existing monitoring indicators are relevant at appropriate scales for Indigenous land users. Once complete, the communities will be better placed to inform TACs where there are gaps in current monitoring for reasons of scale.

## 8.0 Transparency

### **Evaluation of Transparency Criteria (Information Box Only- No action required)**

Your workplan will be evaluated against the criteria below. A successful workplan would potentially include:

- a plan for dissemination of monitoring data, including appropriate timing, format, and aligns with OSM program data management plan
- demonstrated transparency in past performance
- identified an annual progress report as a deliverable
- reporting of monitoring results occurs at timing and format that is appropriate for recipient audience.

Explain how your monitoring generates data and reporting that is accessible, credible and useful. As relevant, consider adaptive monitoring, the TAC specific Scope of Work document and the Key Questions in your response.

This work will provide deliverables aimed at better informing the execution of the Oil Sands Monitoring Program. The Knowledge Translation Plan will outline how best to interpret, collate and communicate results to the communities, which will be informative for future state of environment reports. Similarly, the analytical work will be prepared in a report that will be shared with the program, and inform the communities' inputs into the program. Finally, the work will involve community engagement workshops and verification sessions.

## 9.0 Efficiency

### **Evaluation of Efficiency Criteria (Information Box Only- No action required)**

Your workplan will be evaluated against the criteria below. A successful workplan would include:

- appropriately addressed a risk-informed allocation of resources
- identified the role and justification for each staff member on the proposed work plan
- identified in-kind and leveraged resources (e.g., resources and approaches are appropriately shared with other OSM projects where possible)
- established partnerships (value-added) and demonstrated examples of coordinated efficiencies (e.g., field, analytical)
- identified co-location of monitoring effort
- demonstrated monitoring activities and information collected are not duplicative
- considered sampling/measurement/methods compatibility to other data sources (e.g., AER)

Explain how your monitoring is integrated with other OSM projects and incorporates community-based participation and/or engagement in proposed monitoring activities. As relevant, consider adaptive monitoring, the TAC specific Scope of Work document and the Key Questions in your response.

For this work we are including Indigenous TAC representatives to minimize the potential of duplicating work that may be requested in 23-24 in individual TACs. We are also collaborating with the Indigenous Community Based Monitoring Advisory Committee on their work on establishing socio-cultural limits of change, and where our work identifies information that informs culturally relevant indicators or baseline conditions, and where there is permission from the community, this will be shared with ICBMAC. Our work on Knowledge Translation may inform the ICBMAC's work on contributing to Indigenous perspectives on the State of Environment Reports. Finally, an aim of the work is to improve efficiency within the core monitoring program by identifying key responsive indicators that are important to communities, and data gaps associated with those indicators. Finally, community engagement will leverage plans and support for individual communities to do work internally to identify their key priorities.

## 10.0 Work Plan Approach/Methods

### 10.1 List the Key Project Phases and Provide Bullets for Each Major Task under Each Project Phase \*

The sub-caucus has identified a knowledge translation plan, defining baseline and limits of change from the Indigenous perspective as key priorities. This requires:

- a) Working with communities to identify key indicators
- b) Assessing the power and suitability of existing OSM indicators
- c) Working with communities to prioritize indicators and identify mechanisms for defining baseline.

Engaging the communities and assessing the questions will be guided by a knowledge translation plan, and analytical framework designed by the sub-caucus and technical representatives. The success of this work assumes that the team has access to needed data, can hire support for data analysis, that community engagement will be coordinated with communities, and project management is provided by the sub-caucus coordinator.

#### Phase 1: Preparation

- Collecting needed data from OSM priority areas. Different TACs have data at different levels of accessibility and some programs are better developed than others. In this phase we will focus on those priority areas with the most well-developed data: water quality, air quality and deposition, hydrometric data. We will work with TAC leads to access data from other programs (wetlands, terrestrial biodiversity, groundwater) recognizing that this might take time.
- Data will be collated and the team will identify where there are data gaps, including identifying what compliance monitoring data may be useful for future analyses. Where possible, the team will request these data from the AER or from the OSM program, as appropriate.
- Developing analysis framework: how will the strength of indicators be measured? This will include reviewing the work from the Data Analytics TAC on the monitoring framework development.
- Developing community framework: how will communities identify their information needs, key indicators, and their baselines?
- Developing knowledge translation framework: how will communities identify their information needs, how will research inform these needs, how will the technical and community work prioritize approaches and define baseline?

#### Phase 2a: Data analysis

- Technical representatives will compile and assess existing analyses.
- Workshop for terrestrial biological, wetlands and groundwater theme areas to assess their readiness and the state of the existing data and analyses.
- Workshop on toxicology and contaminants to link work done between the different priority areas.
- Technical representatives and data analytics support will assess existing OSM indicators for their:
  - o Power
  - o Responsiveness to stressor pathways
  - o Spatial and temporal scales

#### Phase 2b: Community input

- Community representatives and relevant technical specialists will work with communities to identify information needs, key indicators, and some information to support characterization of baseline. This work will be coordinated with community-specific work to define key concerns.
- Communities will identify their key areas of concern and do work to determine internally what elements of environmental change are impacting communities' rights, livelihoods, food security and culture. Note that this work also informs work being done by the Indigenous Community Based Monitoring Advisory Committee.

#### Phase 3: Prioritization and reporting

- Using information from Phase 2, the communities and technical team will prioritize the OSM indicators and either define their baseline, or identify steps to fully define baseline.

Phase 4: Verification

- Community representatives will work with their communities to verify the findings of Phase 3.

**10.2** Describe how changes in environmental Condition will be assessed \*

Likens and Lindenmayer (2010) developed criteria useful for assessing whether a monitoring program is effective. Key considerations include evaluating the design, ensuring that the monitoring is targeted and linked to key questions, has appropriate indicators and avoids monitoring a “laundry list” of indicators. The OSM program has had limited success evaluating the design to ensure that indicators are appropriate, targeted and linked to key questions. In this workplan, the technical team, guided by an improved understanding of community key questions and information needs, will assess the appropriateness of existing indicators.

The technical team will assess the existing OSM data for priority indicators for change in environmental condition using commonly accepted statistical techniques, as outlined in the analysis framework from Phase 1. The intent of the workplan is to determine the power of specific indicators to detect change. We are also evaluating whether priority indicators are responsive to oil sands stressors. This requires statistical modeling techniques for prioritized indicators, provided that sufficient data are available.

Likens, GE and Lindenmayer, DB. 2010. The science and application of ecological monitoring. *Biological Conservation*, 143: 1317-1328.

**10.3** Are There Benchmarks Being Used to Assess Changes in Environmental Condition? If So, Please Describe, If Not, State “NONE” \*

We will assess data against Indigenous indicators and thresholds, such as the Fort McKay Air Aquality Index and the Aboriginal Navigation Index, that are defined by the community. However, developing new Indigenous limits of change is the goal of future years.

(e.g., objectives, tiers, triggers, limits, reference conditions, thresholds, etc.)

**10.4** Provide a Brief Description of the Western Science or Community-Based Monitoring Indigenous Community-Based Monitoring Methods by Project Phase \*

Phase 1: We will use standardized approaches for developing a knowledge translation plan that will enhance the communities' ability to use OSM data and to guide the development of a cohesive monitoring framework. We will also establish the analytical framework which will guide the data analysis. This includes developing an agreed-upon approach for data management, power analysis, and modeling.

Phase 2a: In our initial workshop, the team will assess the state of the available data and prioritize indicators for which there are sufficient available data to do analysis. The indicators will be further prioritized via discussions with communities in Phase 2b. The team will then analyze the power and specificity of priority indicators, using guidance developed in Phase 1.

Phase 2b: Communities will each do their own work to identify key questions and priority indicators. Communities will consider what elements of environmental change attributable to oil sands development have impacted their rights, livelihoods, food security and culture. Community work will be driven by rigorous social science approaches using communities' existing engagement supports, and adhere to both OSM and community ethics guidelines.



Phase 3: The team and community representatives will develop a rubric for prioritizing indicators that considers both the power and specificity determined in Phase 2a and community priorities and Indigenous knowledge about the indicators' behaviour. Using this rubric, the team and community representatives will prioritize indicators and outline recommendations for improved monitoring, development of baseline, or development of Indigenous Limits of Change. The team will refer to the knowledge translation plan developed in Phase I to develop the final report and make recommendations for ongoing reporting and engagement.

**10.5** List the Key Indicators Measured, If Not Applicable, State N/A \*

List of key indicators to be determined, based on an analysis of existing indicators collected through core monitoring.

## 11.0 Knowledge Translation

*In the space below, please provide the following:*

- Describe the plan for knowledge transfer and distribution of learnings from the project. This could include workshops, publications, best practice documentation, marketing plan, etc.
- Demonstrate that the knowledge transfer plan is appropriate for the intended end-users.

Community members frequently express the sentiment that monitoring is not management – and monitoring is only useful insofar as it influences the management of oil sands and protection of their rights, culture, and landscape. Though communities have been asked to define their key questions and interests, there has not been a systematic approach to understanding the information needs of communities as decision makers and ensuring that monitoring meets these needs.

Knowledge Translation means moving beyond a paradigm that views research as a commodity to be exchanged and decision making as an event. Rather both are processes, sometimes messy, that work best when coordinated (Lomas 2000.) While the OSM Program has a stated goal of supporting decision making of industry, governments and Indigenous communities, there has been little effort to build processes that support this ongoing exchange. Without this support, monitoring risks veering towards what is interesting, rather than what is important, and decision makers lose trust in the monitoring outputs (Cook et al. 2013.) For monitoring outcomes to inform decision making, the information must be “salient (relevant and timely), credible (authoritative, believable and trusted), and legitimate (developed via a process that considers the values and perspectives of all actors).” (Cook et al. 2013). Without effort to bridge the needs of the communities with the execution of monitoring, monitoring loses salience and legitimacy.

This is a particularly pressing issue for Indigenous communities. Decades of development have resulted in various impacts to the landscape that contribute to social, cultural, and rights-based impacts.

Communities have in many cases been assured by the Crown that their concerns will be mitigated, in part, by environmental monitoring. From the communities' perspective, this means that monitoring must be actionable, and increase the ability of members to make informed decisions about their landscape, resources, and to empower land management decisions.

This knowledge translation approach will focus exclusively on Indigenous communities as knowledge end users. It will address the following phases:

- 1) identifying decision makers: their information needs, their concerns, and their understanding of cause-effect relationships leading to changes in the environment
- 2) identifying community knowledge gaps along with an understanding of why the communities have these questions: what has changed? What decisions do land users make that would benefit from more data? What decisions do communities make about their rights, culture, and management approaches? What information would support these decisions?
- 3) co-developing analytical approaches to existing data, and identification of monitoring gaps
- 4) co-developing key messages and metrics to develop (many of which, such as Indigenous limits of change, may be the subject of future projects)
- 5) co-developing knowledge translation goals (empowerment? Awareness? Improved safety? Improved trust in traditional resources?) and strategies (educational outreach? Community-focused state of environment reporting? co-development of monitoring programs?)
- 6) co-developing metrics for evaluating the effectiveness of monitoring data and knowledge translation from the Indigenous perspective.

This plan will support not only the ability of communities to understand and influence the core monitoring program, but also inform ongoing efforts to develop and braid Indigenous community-based monitoring. References:

Cook et al. 2013. Achieving Conservation Science that Bridges the Knowledge–Action Boundary. *Conservation Biology*, 27(4): 669

Lomas, J. 2000. Using 'Linkage and Exchange' to move research into policy at a Canadian foundation. *Health Affairs*, 19(3).

## 12.0 External Partners

List by project or project phase each component that will be delivered by an external party (including analytical laboratories) and name the party. Describe and name the associate work plan/grant/contract for these services. \* state none if not required

Phase 1: Community representatives of:

Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation  
 Chipewyan Prairie Dene First Nation  
 Fort Chipewyan Métis Community  
 Fort McKay First Nation  
 McKay Métis Nation  
 Mikisew Cree First Nation  
 Fort McMurray #468 First Nation  
 Conklin Métis  
 Owl River Métis  
 Chard Métis Nation  
 Willow Lake Métis Nation

Decision making among the group will be governed by the Wood Buffalo Indigenous Sub-Caucus decision making guidelines.

Carla Davidson (Endeavour Scientific), Monique Dube (Cumulative Effects Environmental Inc), and Mandy Olsgard (Integrated Toxicology Inc), Donald Robinson (ESSA Environmental).

Phase 2a: Technical Advisory Committee Indigenous representatives: Donald Robinson, Mandy Olsgard, Monique Dube, Lisa Schaldemose, Megan Thompson, Tahina Choudry, Owen Quinn, David Spink, Ryan Abel, Brian Kopach, Gillian Donald. Additional outside support includes analytical, data management and GIS support.

Phase 2b: Community engagement support as chosen by the communities.

Phase 3: Community and technical team representatives.

\*To ensure complete work plan proposal submission, all grants and contracts listed in this section should also be captured in Grants & Contracts.

## 13.0 Data Sharing and Data Management

For 2022-23 the following approach will be taken by the OSM Program related to data sharing.

For all work plans of a **western science** nature funded under the OSM Program, data sharing is a condition of funding and must align with the principle of "**Open by Default**". In this case, all data is to be shared with the OSM Program as directed by the OSM Program Data Management work plan.

For all work plans involving **Indigenous Knowledge** as defined below and funded under the OSM Program, data sharing is a condition of funding and the Indigenous Knowledge components of the work plan must align with the principle of "**Protected by Default**". In this case, all data as defined as Indigenous Knowledge, are to be retained by the Indigenous community to which the Indigenous Knowledge is held.

*Indigenous Knowledge is defined as:*

"The knowledge held by First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples, the Aboriginal peoples of Canada. Traditional knowledge is specific to place, usually transmitted orally, and rooted in the experience of multiple generations. It is determined by an Aboriginal community's land, environment, region, culture and language. Traditional knowledge is usually described by Aboriginal peoples as holistic, involving body, mind, feelings and spirit. Knowledge may be expressed in symbols, arts, ceremonial and everyday practices, narratives and, especially, in relationships. The word tradition is not necessarily synonymous with old. Traditional knowledge is held collectively by all members of a community, although some members may have particular responsibility for its transmission. It includes preserved knowledge created by, and received from, past generations and innovations and new knowledge transmitted to subsequent generations. In international or scholarly discourse, the terms traditional knowledge and Indigenous knowledge are sometimes used interchangeably."

*This definition was taken from the Canadian Government's Tri-council Policy Statement for Ethical Research involving Humans (Chapter 9, pg. 113) and is an interim definition specific to the Oil Sands Monitoring Program.*

**Data Sharing and Data Management** *Continued*

13.1 Has there, or will there be, a Data Sharing agreement established through this Project? \*

YES

13.2 Type of Quantitative Data Variables:

Both

13.3 Frequency of Collection:

Other

13.4 Estimated Data Collection Start Date:

2023-04-03

13.5 Estimated Data Collection End Date:

2023-12-04

13.6 Estimated Timeline For Upload Start Date:

Click or tap to enter a date.

13.7 Estimated Timeline For Upload End Date:

Click or tap to enter a date.

13.8 Will the data Include traditional knowledge as defined by and provided by an Indigenous representative, Community or Organization?

YES

**TABLE 13.9 Please describe below the Location of Data and Data Type:**

*Add a Data Source by clicking on the table and then clicking on the blue "+" symbol on the bottom right side of table*

Name of Dataset	Location of Dataset (E.g.: Path, Website, Database, etc.)	Data File Formats (E.g.: csv, txt, API, accdb, xlsx, etc.)	Security Classification
Click or tap here to enter text.	Each community will maintain their own internal data Indigenous knowledge.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Protected by Default

## 14.0 2023/24 Deliverables

Add an additional deliverable by clicking on the table and then clicking on the blue "+" symbol on the bottom right side of table.

Type of Deliverable	Delivery Date	Description
Key Engagement/Participation Meeting	Q2	Workshop with community representatives and engagement support to design engagement approach.
Key Engagement/Participation Meeting	Q2	Workshop of technical and community representatives to assess the state of available data, and establish analysis framework
Key Engagement/Participation Meeting	Q3	Engagement meetings in 11 communities to identify community priorities and information needs
Key Engagement/Participation Meeting	Q4	Joint community representative and technical workshop to prioritize indicators
Technical Report	Q2	Gap analysis report, including identification of compliance data needs
Technical Report	Q1	Knowledge Translation Plan
Technical Report	Q1	Technical report: Indigenous indicator prioritization.
OSM Program Annual Progress Report (required)	Q1	Progress report outlining findings of the team.

## 15.0 Project Team & Partners

In the space below please provide information on the following:

- Describe key members of the project team, including roles, responsibilities and expertise relevant to the proposed project.
- Describe the competency of this team to complete the project.
- Identify any personnel or expertise gaps for successful completion of the project relative to the OSM Program mandate and discuss how these gaps will be addressed.
- Describe the project management approach and the management structure.

Community representatives include:

Lisa Tsessaze and Lori Cyprien, Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation  
 Chris Heavy Shield and Ave Dersch, Chipewyan Prairie Dene First Nation  
 Lisa Schaldemose and Carmen Wells, Fort Chipewyan Metis Community  
 Ryan Abel and Bori Arrobo, Fort McKay First Nation  
 Dan Stuckless and Adi Adiele, Fort McKay Metis Nation  
 Melody Lepine and Lindsay Wong, Mikisew Cree First Nation  
 Velma Whittington, Fort McMurray #468 First Nation  
 Peter Fortna, Chard and Conklin Metis  
 Destiny Martin, Willow Lake Metis  
 [...] Owl River Metis.

The technical team is comprised of the following Technical TAC representatives: Donald Robinson, Mandy Olsgard, Monique Dube, Lisa Schaldemose, Megan Thompson, Tahina Choudry, Owen Quinn, David Spink, Ryan Abel, Brian Kopach, Gillian Donald. Each of these representatives is a technical expert in their theme area with experience and familiarity with the program, and with community priorities.

The analytical framework will be developed by Dr. Monique Dube, Dr. Carla Davidson, Mandy Olsgard and Dr. Donald Robinson, each of whom has a postgraduate degree and experience in either cumulative effects management, adaptive monitoring or risk assessment,

Project Lead and Knowledge Mobilization support is Carla Davidson, who has a PhD in Systems Biology, extensive experience with the communities and with knowledge mobilization at the science/policy/Indigenous interface.

The Project will require data analytics, database, statistical and project management support. Funds under this grant will support the hiring of a community member to provide project management support and build community capacity.

Decisions on direction of the study will be affirmed by the community representatives, using decision making framework outlined in the Wood Buffalo Indigenous Sub-Caucus Terms of Reference.



## 16.0 Project Human Resources & Financing

### Section 16.1 Human Resource Estimates

Building off of the competencies listed in the previous section, please complete the table below. Add additional rows as necessary. This table must include **ALL staff involved** in the project, their role and the % of that staff's time allocated to this work plan. The AEP calculated amount is based on an estimate of \$120,000/year for FTEs. This number cannot be changed. The OSM program recognizes that this is an estimate.

#### Table 16.1.1 AEP

Add an additional AEP Staff member by clicking on the table and then clicking on the blue "+" symbol on the bottom right side of table. The total FTE (Full Time Equivalent) is Auto Summed (in Table 16.2.1) and converted to a dollar amount.

Name (Last, First)	Role	% Time Allocated to Project
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	0%

#### Table 16.1.2 ECCC

Add an additional ECCC Staff member by clicking on the table and then clicking on the blue "+" symbol on the bottom right side of table. The total FTE (Full Time Equivalent) is Auto Summed in Table 16.2.2

Name (Last, First)	Role	% Time Allocated to Project
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	0%



The tables below are the financial tables for Alberta Environment & Parks (AEP) and Environment & Climate Change Canada. All work plans under the OSM Program require either a government lead or a government coordinator.

### Section 16.2 Financing

The OSM Program recognizes that many of these submissions are a result of joint effort and monitoring initiatives. A detailed "PROJECT FINANCE BREAKDOWN" must be provided using the Project Finance Breakdown Template provided, accessible here (ctrl + click the link below). Please note that completion of this Project Finance Breakdown Template is mandatory and must be submitted along with each workplan.

## [PROJECT FINANCE BREAKDOWN TEMPLATE \(CTRL+CLICK HERE\)](#)

**Table 16.2.1 Funding Requested BY ALBERTA ENVIRONMENT & PARKS**

Organization – Alberta Environment & Parks ONLY	Total % time allocated to project for AEP staff	Total Funding Requested from OSM
<b>Salaries and Benefits</b> <i>(Calculated from Table 16.1.1 above)</i>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Operations and Maintenance</b>		
Consumable materials and supplies		\$0.00
Conferences and meetings travel		\$0.00
Project-related travel		\$0.00
Engagement		\$0.00
Reporting		\$0.00
Overhead		\$0.00
<b>Total All Grants</b> <i>(Calculated from Table 16.4 below)</i>		<b>\$663,300.00</b>
<b>Total All Contracts</b> <i>(Calculated from Table 16.5 below)</i>		<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Sub- TOTAL</b> <i>(Calculated)</i>		<b>\$663,300.00</b>
Capital*		\$0.00
<b>AEP TOTAL</b> <i>(Calculated)</i>		<b>\$663,300.00</b>

\* The Government of Alberta Financial Policies (Policy # A600) requires that all **capital asset** purchases comply with governmental and departmental legislation, policies, procedures, directives and guidelines. **Capital assets** (Financial Policy # A100, Government of Alberta, January 2014) are tangible assets that: have economic life greater than one year; are acquired, constructed, or developed for use on a continuing basis; are not held for sale in ordinary course of operations; are recorded and tracked centrally; have a cost greater than \$5,000.

Some **examples of capital asset equipment include:** laboratory equipment, appliances, boats, motors, field equipment, ATV's/snowmobiles, stationary equipment (pier/sign/weather), fire/safety equipment, pumps/tanks, heavy equipment, irrigation systems, furniture, trailers, vehicles, etc. (Financial Policy # A100, Government of Alberta, January 2014).

**Table 16.2.2 Funding Requested BY ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE CHANGE CANADA**

Organization – Environment & Climate Change Canada ONLY	Total % time allocated to project for ECCC staff	Total Funding Requested from OSM
<b>Salaries and Benefits FTE</b> <i>(Please manually provide the number in the space below)</i>		
Salaries and Benefits		\$0.00
<b>Operations and Maintenance</b>		
Consumable materials and supplies		\$0.00
Conferences and meetings travel		\$0.00
Project-related travel		\$0.00
Engagement		\$0.00
Reporting		\$0.00
Overhead		\$0.00
<b>ECCC TOTAL</b> <i>(Calculated)</i>		<b>\$0.00</b>

\* ECCC cannot request capital under the OSM program. Any capital requirements to support long-term monitoring under the OSM program should be procured by Alberta and captured in that budget table.

**Table 16.3**

**Complete ONE table per Grant recipient.**

*Add a Recipient by clicking on the table and then clicking on the blue "+" symbol on the bottom right side of table. The total of all Grants is Auto Summed in Table 16.2.1*

GRANT RECIPIENT - ONLY: Name	Ryan Abel
GRANT RECIPIENT - ONLY: Organization	Fort McKay First Nation
<b>Category</b>	<b>Total Funding Requested from OSM</b>
Salaries and Benefits	\$430,000.00
<b>Operations and Maintenance</b>	
Consumable materials and supplies	\$0.00
Conferences and meetings travel	\$0.00
Project-related travel	\$20,000.00
Engagement	\$108,000.00
Reporting	\$45,000.00
Overhead	\$60,300.00
GRANT TOTAL <i>(Calculated)</i>	<b>\$663,300.00</b>

**Table 16.4**

**Complete ONE table per Contract recipient.**

*Add a Recipient by clicking on the table and then clicking on the blue "+" symbol on the bottom right side of table. This section is only to be completed should the applicant intend to contract components or stages of the project out to external organizations. The total of all Contracts is Auto Summed in Table 16.2.1*

CONTRACT RECIPIENT - ONLY: Name	Click or tap here to enter text.
CONTRACT RECIPIENT - ONLY: Organization	Click or tap here to enter text.
<b>Category</b>	<b>Total Funding Requested from OSM</b>
Salaries and Benefits	\$0.00
<b>Operations and Maintenance</b>	
Consumable materials and supplies	\$0.00
Conferences and meetings travel	\$0.00
Project-related travel	\$0.00
Engagement	\$0.00
Reporting	\$0.00
Overhead	\$0.00
CONTRACT TOTAL <i>(Calculated)</i>	<b>\$0.00</b>

**Table 16.5 GRAND TOTAL Project Funding Requested from OSM Program**

The table below is auto calculated, please do not try to manually manipulate these contents.

Category	Total Funding Requested from OSM
<b>Salaries and Benefits</b> <i>Sums totals for salaries and benefits from AEP and ECCC ONLY</i>	\$0.00
<b>Operations and Maintenance</b>	
<b>Consumable materials and supplies</b> <i>Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY</i>	\$0.00
<b>Conferences and meetings travel</b> <i>Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY</i>	\$0.00
<b>Project-related travel</b> <i>Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY</i>	\$0.00
<b>Engagement</b> <i>Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY</i>	\$0.00
<b>Reporting</b> <i>Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY</i>	\$0.00
<b>Overhead</b> <i>Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY</i>	\$0.00
<b>Total All Grants (from table 16.2.1 above)</b> <i>Sums totals for AEP Tables ONLY</i>	\$663,300.00
<b>Total All Contracts (from table 16.2.1 above)</b> <i>Sums totals for AEP Tables ONLY</i>	\$0.00
<b>Sub- TOTAL</b>	\$663,300.00
<b>Capital*</b> <i>Sums total for AEP</i>	\$0.00
<b>GRAND PROJECT TOTAL</b>	\$663,300.00

Some **examples of capital asset equipment include:** laboratory equipment, appliances, boats, motors, field equipment, ATV's/snowmobiles, stationary equipment (pier/sign/weather), fire/safety equipment, pumps/tanks, heavy equipment, irrigation systems, furniture, trailers, vehicles, etc. (*Financial Policy # A100, Government of Alberta, January 2014*).

## 17.0 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

**The OSM Program reserves the right to reallocate project funding during the current fiscal year on the basis of project performance and financial overspend or underspend.**

Please check this box to acknowledge you have read and understand

**In the space below please describe the following:**

- Discuss how potential cost overruns and cost underruns will be managed.
- If this is a continuing project from last year, identify if this project was overspent or underspent in the previous year and explain why.
- Describe what risks and/or barriers may affect this project.

Fort McKay First Nation will provide financial management of the project. Grants in the amount of \$5,000 will be provided to each participating community to cover internal costs. Community engagement will be coordinated with ongoing internal engagement to identify community priorities. The majority of costs incurred in this program are consulting time. Invoices for technical team members, project support consultants (statistics, project management, data management, junior analytics support) and engagement support personnel will be paid monthly, allowing the team to prioritize subsequent analytical work as results from the data survey and community work comes in. Contractors will be made aware of their funding envelope, and any deviation from this envelope will require approval by the community representatives, using the process outlined in the Wood Buffalo Indigenous Sub-Caucus Terms of Reference.

## 18.0 Alternate Sources of Project Financing – In-Kind Contributions

**Table 18.1 In-kind Contributions**

*Add an In Kind Contribution by clicking on the table and then clicking on the blue "+" symbol on the bottom right side of table.*

DESCRIPTION	SOURCE	EQUIVALENT AMOUNT (\$CAD)
Existing community engagement processes and support	Oil Sands Monitoring Indigenous Caucus Support, and existing community support structures	\$407,000.00
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$407,000.00</b>



## 19.0 Consent & Declaration of Completion

**Lead Applicant Name**

Carla Davidson

**Title/Organization**

Wood Buffalo Indigenous Sub-Caucus

**Signature**

Carla Davidson

**Date**

2022-10-31

**Government Lead / Government Coordinator Name** (if different from lead applicant)

Click or tap here to enter text.

**Title/Organization**

Click or tap here to enter text.

**Signature**

Click or tap here to enter text.

**Date**

Click or tap to enter a date.





## PROGRAM OFFICE USE ONLY

### **Governance Review & Decision Process**

*this phase follows submission and triggers the Governance Review*

**TAC Review (Date):**

Click or tap to enter a date.

**ICBMAC Review (Date):**

Click or tap to enter a date.

**SIKIC Review (Date):**

Click or tap to enter a date.

**OC Review (Date):**

Click or tap to enter a date.

**Final Recommendations:**

**Decision Pool:**

Choose an item.

**Notes:**

Click or tap here to enter text.

### **Post Decision: Submission Work Plan Revisions Follow-up Process**

*This phase will only be implemented if the final recommendation requires revisions and follow-up from governance*

**ICBMAC Review (Date):**

Click or tap to enter a date.

**SIKIC Review (Date):**

Click or tap to enter a date.

**OC Review (Date):**

Click or tap to enter a date.

**Comments:**

**Decision Pool:**

Choose an item.

**Notes & Additional Actions for Successful Work Plan Implementation:**

Click or tap here to enter text.